



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/822,113	03/30/2001	Stanley R. Miska	85917.000307	9192
23387	7590	08/25/2004	EXAMINER	
Stephen B. Salai, Esq. Harter, Secrest & Emery LLP 1600 Bausch & Lomb Place Rochester, NY 14604-2711			SINGH, ARTI R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1771	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/822,113

Applicant(s)

MISKA, STANLEY R.

Examiner

Ms. Arti Singh

Art Unit

1771

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 18-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I claims 1-17 in the reply filed on 06/01/04 is acknowledged. Please cancel nonelected claims.

***Specification***

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
3. The uses of Trademarks/Tradenames have been noted throughout this application. The specific name/mark should be in ALL CAPS, followed by either a trademark or copyright symbol ® and then be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of Trademarks/Tradenames is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks/names should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner, which might adversely affect their validity as a trademark or tradename. To describe physical or other properties of material by mere use of trademark is objectionable since it has tendency to make trademark descriptive of product rather than leaving trademark to serve its traditional purpose, which is to identify product's source of origin. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:  

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
5. Claims 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
6. Claims 10 and 12 are indefinite for the use of tradenames/copyrights such as INCONEL® OR NICHROME® are in the claims. Where a trademark or tradename is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does

not comply with the requirements of 35 USC 112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. *See Ex Parte Simpson, 218 USPQ 1020*. The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or tradename cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves.

7. Claim 17 recites the limitation "a dielectric layer" in line 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

#### *Double Patenting*

8. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. *See In re Goodman, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).*

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. *See 37 CFR 1.130(b).*

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

9. Claims 1-17 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of copending Application No US 2002/0129494 A1. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they

are not patentably distinct from each other because they appear to be obvious variants of one another.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

10. Claims 1-17 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,541,698.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they appear to be obvious variants of one another.

11. Claims 1-17 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of U.S. Patent No. 6,465,731.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they appear to be obvious variants of one another.

12. Claims 1-17 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over the claims of U.S. Patent No.

5,712,449; 6,541,698. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they appear to be obvious variants of one another.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103***

13. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 1771

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 6387523 issued to Bunyan et al.

16. Bunyan et al disclose a flame retardant, electromagnetic interference (EMI) shielding gasket construction. The construction includes a resilient core member formed of a foamed elastomeric material, an electrically-conductive fabric member surrounding the outer surface of the core member, and a flame retardant layer coating at least a portion of the interior surface of the fabric member. The flame retardant layer is effective to afford the gasket construction with a flame class rating of V-0 under Underwriter's Laboratories (UL) Standard No. 94 (abstract). The present invention is directed to an electrically-conductive, flame

Art Unit: 1771

retardant material for use in fabric-over-foam EMI shielding gaskets, and to a method of manufacturing the same. In having a layer of a flame retardant coating applied to one side of an electrically conductive, generally porous fabric, the material of the invention affords UL94 V-0 protection when used as a jacketing in a fabric-over-foam gasket construction.

Advantageously, as the flame retardant layer may be wet coated on the fabric without appreciable bleed through, a relatively thin, i.e., 2-4 mil (0.05-0.10 mm), coating layer may be provided on one fabric side without compromising the electrical surface conductivity of the other side. Such a thin coating layer, while being sufficient to provide UL94 V-0 protection, nonetheless maintains the drapability the fabric and thereby facilitates the construction UL94 V-0 compliant gaskets having complex profiles or narrow cross-sections down to about 1 mm. In a preferred embodiment, the electrically-conductive, flame retardant EMI shielding material of the invention includes a nickel or silver-plated, woven nylon, polyester, or like fabric on one side of which is wet coated a layer of a flame retardant, acrylic latex emulsion or other fluent resin composition. In accordance with the precepts of the method of the invention, the viscosity and hydrodynamic pressure of the emulsion are controlled such that the coating does not penetrate or otherwise "bleed through" the uncoated side of the fabric. The surface conductivity of the opposite side of the fabric therefore is not compromised in EMI shielding applications. The material of the invention may be employed as a jacket in fabric-over-foam EMI shielding gasket constructions, and is particularly adapted for use in the continuous molding process for such gaskets. As used within such process, the fabric may be wrapped around the foam as a jacket with coated side thereof being disposed as an interior surface adjacent the foam, and the uncoated side being disposed as an electrically-conductive exterior surface. Advantageously, the coating on the

interior surface of the jacket blocks the pores of the fabric to retain the foam therein without penetrate or bleed through to the exterior surface. In being formed of a acrylic material, the coated interior surface of the jacket may function, moreover, depending upon the composition of the foam, as a compatibilizing or "tie" interlayer which promotes the bonding of the foam to the fabric. The present invention, accordingly, comprises material and method possessing the construction, combination of elements, and arrangement of parts and steps which are exemplified in the detailed disclosure to follow. Advantages of the present invention include a flame retardant yet drapable EMI shielding fabric. Additional advantages include an economical, flame retardant EMI shielding fabric construction wherein a relatively thin layer of a flame retardant coating may be wet coated onto one side of an electrically conductive, woven or other generally porous EMI shielding fabric without compromising the conductivity of the other side of the fabric. These and other advantages will be readily apparent to those skilled in the art based upon the disclosure contained herein (paragraphs bridging column 1 and 2). Fabric member has at least an electrically-conductive first side, 16, and a conductive or non-conductive second side, 18, defining a thickness dimension, Referenced at "t.sub.1" in the cross-sectional view of FIG. 2, which may vary from about 2-4 mils (0.05-0.10 mm). By "electrically-conductive," it is meant that the fabric may be rendered conductive, i.e., to a surface resistivity of about 0.1  $\Omega$ /sq. or less, by reason of its being constructed of electrically-conductive wire, monofilaments, yarns or other fibers or, alternatively, by reason of a treatment such as a plating or sputtering being applied to non-conductive fibers to provide an electrically-conductive layer thereon. Preferred electrically-conductive fibers include Monel nickel-copper alloy, silver-plated copper, nickel-clad copper, Ferrex tin-plated copper-clad steel, aluminum, tin-clad copper, phosphor bronze, carbon, graphite, and conductive polymers. Preferred non-conductive fibers include cotton, wool,



silk, cellulose, polyester, polyamide, nylon, and polyimide monofilaments or yarns which are rendered electrically conductive with a metal plating of copper, nickel, silver, nickel-plated-silver, aluminum, tin, or an alloy thereof. As is known, the metal plating may applied to individual fiber strands or to the surfaces of the fabric after weaving, knitting, or other fabrication (column 5). Although a plain, square weave pattern such as a taffeta, tabby, or ripstop is considered preferred, other weaves such as satins, twills, and the like also should be considered within the scope of the invention herein involved. A particularly preferred cloth for fabric member 12 is a 4 mil (0.10 mm) thick, 1.8 oz/yd.sup.2 weight, silver-plated, woven nylon which is marketed commercially under the designation "31EN RIPSTOP" by Swift Textile Metalizing Corp., Bloomfield, Conn. However, depending upon the needs of the specific shielding application, a fabric constructed of a combination or blend of conductive and nonconductive fibers alternatively may be employed (column 6, lines 18-30). The composite may contain convention al and well known additives in the flame retardant layer such as aluminum hydrate or halogenated compounds (column 6, line 59- column 7, line 10).

With regards to the metal layer being deposited via vapor deposition (claims 8 and 16 specifically), the Examiner takes Official notice that vapor deposition is the best-known and most utilized method of attaching a metal layer to a fabric. Additionally, the patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the claim is the same as or obvious from a product of the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process. *In re Thorpe*, 227 USPQ 964, 966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). The burden has been shifted to the applicant to show unobvious differences between the claimed product and the prior art product. *In re Marosi*, 218 USPQ 289, 292 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The Bunyan reference either anticipated or strongly suggested the claimed subject matter. It is noted that if the applicant intends to rely on Examples in the specification or in

Art Unit: 1771

a submitted Declaration to show non-obviousness, the applicant should clearly state how the Examples of the present invention are commensurate in scope with the claims and how the Comparative Examples are commensurate in scope with that of Bunyan et al.

With regard to the property limitations of surface resistance and having a burn test ration of zero the Examiner takes the position, given that Bunyan et al disclose what is set forth above, but do not explicitly suggest that the claimed abrasion resistance, surface resistance or burn test ratios as desired by Applicant. It is reasonable to presume that the said featured properties are inherent to the composite of Bunyan et al. Support for said presumption is found in the use of like materials that is, that is a fabric coated with a flame retardant coating which is further plated with a metal made of the same fibers, same weave and the same type of metal as that desired by Applicant, which would result in having these properties. The burden is shifted to Applicant to prove otherwise. *In re Fitzgerald* 205 USPQ 495. Alternatively, the presently claimed properties of abrasion resistance, surface resistance or burn test ratios would obviously have been present, once the Veiga et al. product was provided. *See In re Best*, 195 USPQ 433.

Therefore, Bunyan et al. anticipate or render obvious a flame retardant metalized article as envisioned by Applicant.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ms. Arti Singh whose telephone number is 571-272-1483. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-7pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Terrel Morris can be reached on 571-272-1478. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1771

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'AS' or 'Arti Singh' in a stylized cursive script.

Ms. Arti Singh  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 1771

Ars 08/22/04